

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner (1) rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention; (2) rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tomesko (U.S. Patent No. 4,502,909); (3) rejected claims 10, 12, 14, 16, and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomesko; and (4) objected to claims 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 15, and 17 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 and canceled claims 3, 9, and 10 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1–2, 4–8, and 11–21 remaining pending in the application.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for acknowledging that claims 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 15, and 17 are directed to allowable subject matter.

As a preliminary matter, the title of the present application is “A BLOCKING APPARATUS FOR LENS MANUFACTURING INCLUDING WAX DELIVERY SYSTEM.” This title appears on the initial page of the as-filed application. The Application Data Sheet submitted with the patent application, however, incorrectly listed the title. As such, Applicants would like to Amend the title to bring it into accordance with the title listed on the initial page of the as-filed application.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of allowable claim 3. Applicants have further amended claims 11, 13, 15, and 17 to incorporate the

limitations of claim 10 from which they depend. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are directed to allowable subject matter.

With regard to the Examiner's rejection of claim 10 under §112, second paragraph, the Examiner stated that it is unclear as to what is meant by a fixture adapted to removably fix on the work piece as claimed in line 4. Applicants have canceled claim 10. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejection to claim 10 is rendered moot.

With regard to claims 11, 13, 15, and 17, these claims have been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 10 with the exception that the term "fix" from line 4 of claim 10 was replaced with the term "position." The term "position" was used in claim 9, which was not rejected under §112, second paragraph. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 11, 13, 15, and 17 are allowable for at least the above-stated reason. Applicants further respectfully submit that claims 2, 4-8, 12, 14, 16, and 18-21 that depend from claims 1 and 13 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable independent claims 1 and 13.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 50-0311

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 4, 2005

By: 

Charles W. Chesney
Reg. No. 45,874

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY, AND POPEO, PC
12010 Sunset Hills Road
Suite 900
Reston, Virginia 20190
(703) 464-4800 (Telephone)
(703) 464-4895 (Facsimile)

RES 123241v1